

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KINSEY JEHN KEE,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-00298-ART-CLB

ORDER DISMISSING AND CLOSING  
CASE

Plaintiff Kinsey Jehn Kee brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while detained at Humboldt County Jail. (ECF No. 1-1). On July 14, 2023, this Court ordered Kee to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee on or before September 12, 2023. (ECF No. 3). The Court warned Kee that this action could be dismissed if he failed to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full \$402 filing fee for a civil action by that deadline. (*Id.* at 2). That deadline expired and Kee did not file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, pay the full \$402 filing fee, or otherwise respond.

**I. DISCUSSION**

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to

1 dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the  
2 public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to  
3 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy  
4 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic  
5 alternatives. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217,  
6 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

7 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this  
8 litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of  
9 dismissal of Kee's claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also  
10 weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the  
11 occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or  
12 prosecuting an action. *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir.  
13 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their  
14 merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

15 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic  
16 alternatives can be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the  
17 Court's need to consider dismissal. *See Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983,  
18 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives *before*  
19 the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); *accord*  
20 *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002). Courts "need not  
21 exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but  
22 must explore possible and meaningful alternatives." *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779  
23 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this Court cannot operate without  
24 collecting reasonable fees, and litigation cannot progress without a plaintiff's  
25 compliance with court orders, the only alternative is to enter a second order  
26 setting another deadline. But issuing a second order will only delay the inevitable  
27 and further squander the Court's finite resources because Kee ignored the first  
28

1 order. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these  
2 circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

3 **II. CONCLUSION**

4 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that  
5 they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is  
6 dismissed without prejudice based on Kinsey Jehn Kee's failure to file a fully  
7 complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee  
8 in compliance with this Court's July 14, 2023, order. The Clerk of Court is  
9 directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents  
10 may be filed in this now-closed case. If Kinsey Jehn Kee wishes to pursue his  
11 claims, he must file a complaint in a new case and either pay the required filing  
12 fee or file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

13  
14 DATED THIS 16<sup>th</sup> day of October 2023.

15 

16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 ANNE R. TRAUM  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28